

REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-20. The Examiner is thanked for performing a thorough search. Claims 1, 10 and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. For example, support for the amendments to the claims can be found, among other places, in the original Claim 15.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-10, 13-17, and 20

Claims 1-10, 13-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,850,516 by Schneier et al. (referred to hereinafter as "Schneier"). Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Schneier.

Amended Claim 1 recites,

A security intrusion mitigation method comprising:

utilizing network spanning tree configuration information to determine an action for mitigating diffusion of intrusive attacks between components associated with a network, wherein said spanning tree information includes an indication of an internal diffusion risk, wherein said internal diffusion risk is a risk of said attack diffusing from a first component associated with said network to a second component associated with said network; and performing said action for mitigating diffusion of intrusive attacks automatically, wherein said action for mitigating includes compensation for functional support of prioritized applications. (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that Schneier does not teach or suggest, "an action for mitigating diffusion of intrusive attacks between components associated with a network... said action for mitigating includes compensation for functional support of prioritized applications," as recited by Claim 1.

Schneier teaches a method and apparatus for analyzing information systems using stored tree database structures. For example, referring to the first 4 lines of the abstract, Schneier's method and apparatus "electronically represent and quantify the security of a system as a logical tree structure including leaf nodes representing attacks against the system and intermediate nodes representing various logical combinations of attacks necessary to mount a successful overall

attack.” Referring to Col. 6 lines 53 and 54, the embodiments disclosed by Schneier are described in the context of opening a safe. Col. 7 lines 1-21 describe an example of Schneier’s attack tree, which includes possible ways to illegally open a safe. Examples of the steps include “convince the safe installer to install it improperly,” “cut open the safe,” “pick the lock of the safe,” “convince someone to state the combination.”

However, nowhere does Schneier teach anything about “components associated with a network” let alone teach “an action for mitigating diffusion of intrusive attacks between components associated with a network.” There is nothing in Schneier that is comparable to “a component associated with a network” and therefore Schneier cannot possibly teach an attack diffusing between components associated with a network. Further, Schneier teaches nothing that is comparable to “applications,” “prioritized applications,” “compensation for functional support,” let alone “compensation for functional support of prioritized applications,” as recited by Claim 1.

For at least the forgoing reasons, Claim 1 should be patentable over Schneier. For similar reasons, independent Claim 10 should be patentable over Schneier because independent Claim 10 recites, among other things, “automatically mitigating an attack from spreading between components included in said highest risk path” since Schneier does not teach components included in a highest risk path let alone an attacking spreading between these components. For similar reasons, independent Claim 15 should be patentable over Schneier because independent Claim 15 recites, among other things, “determining a risk of an attack spreading from a first component to a second component included in a network.”

Claims 2-9 depend on Claim 1. Claims 11-14 depend on Claim 10. Claims 16-20 depend on Claim 15. Further, these dependent claims recite additional limitations which further make them patentable. Therefore, these dependent claims should be patentable for at least the reasons that their respective independent claims should be patentable.


CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections of record. For reasons discussed herein, Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 1-20 be considered by the Examiner. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: 4/11/, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



John P. Wagner Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

Address:

Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, California 95076 USA

Telephone:

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 234-3649 Direct/Cell
(408) 722-2350 Facsimile